

II. Remarks

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 are pending in the subject application. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 5 are currently amended. Claim 6 was previously cancelled. All pending claims stand rejected. Support for the amendments may be found in figure 2 and throughout the specification.

Claim Objections U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 for reciting the limitation “the center” stating that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation. The Examiner also states that “it is unclear what is being claimed in the last two lines.” Applicant has amended claim 4 and believes that the amendment addresses the Examiners concerns.

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 stating that “it is unclear what is being claimed in the last three lines.” Applicant has amended claim 5 and believe that the amendment addresses the Examiners concerns.

Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection under U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Masuda et al., 6,199,898, (Masuda) stating that “Masuda et al. disclose, among other things, “Each of the plurality of mounting tabs having an inclined edge . . . being inclined inwardly toward a line lying vertically through a central region of the airbag”.

In order to expedite allowance of the claims, Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify the orientation of the tabs with respect to the upper edge of the airbag.

Masuda does not disclose an airbag with tabs having an outer edge and an inner edge, the inner and the outer edges extending from the upper edge, wherein the inner edge is nearer a line lying vertically through a central region of the air-bag than is the outer edge, and the inner edge and the upper edge define an angle of less than 90° such that the tabs are inclined inwardly towards the line as is required by amended claim 1.

Therefore Masuda does not disclose each and every limitation of claim 1 and as such does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-5 and 7 are dependent from Claim 1 and likewise are not anticipated by Masuda.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Masuda in view of Takahara (US20020140211).

As detailed above, Masuda does not anticipate the subject matter of any of the claims of the present application. The disclosure of Takahara does not make up for the deficiencies of Masuda. Thus, claim 5 is not obvious over Masuda or Takahara, alone, or in combination.

Conclusion

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all the pending claims, 1-5 and 7 are in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections and allow the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 13, 2009

/Cynthia M. Bott/

Cynthia M. Bott, Reg. No. 46,568
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
524 South Main Street
Suite 200
Ann Arbor, MI 48104